



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/758,386	01/15/2004	Memphis-Zhihong Yin	200312164-1	5428

22879 7590 01/23/2008
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

WRIGHT, INGRID D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2835

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

01/23/2008

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM
mkraft@hp.com
ipa.mail@hp.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/758,386

Applicant(s)

YIN ET AL.

Examiner

Ingrid Wright

Art Unit

2835

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 December 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 8-13 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 14-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 18-20 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 January 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5,7 & 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fung et al. US 6217351 B1 (hereinafter: "Fung").

Claim 1, Fung teaches a computer system (e.g. a notebook computer or a mobile phone, col. 8, lines 65-67 & col. 9, lines 1-9, Fung), comprising: a sidewall (e.g. implied but not shown by Fung,) having an aperture (e.g. aperture of body (120, fig. 8, Fung) (note: additional aperture of computer) therethrough; and a multiple-connector apparatus (100) disposed to pass at least partially through the aperture, movable to a retracted position (e.g. position, fig. 11) to conceal at least one of the connectors (170,172) inside the computer system, and movable to an extended position (e.g. position, fig. 10) so multiple in which at least one of the connectors (170,172) are accessible outside of the computer system for simultaneously connecting plural peripheral devices (col. 11, lines 58-60, Fung); and wherein, in the retracted position (fig. 11), only an outer face of the multiple-connector apparatus (100) is exposed through the aperture, but is silent as to the trays (174,176) being combined into a single tray, i.e. the two connectors (170,172) being utilized in a single tray. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the connector tray assembly of Fung, by utilizing a configuration whereby the trays are combined, i.e. utilizing a single tray with the two connector (170,172), instead of the configuration of presently used, in order to provide an alternate tray

configuration, since these configurations are functional equivalents, and it would appear that either type of tray configuration would work equally in allowing a user to connect the plurality of connectors (170,172). For example, a user can connect a connector into a single tray having two connector (170,172), and equally connect a connector in two trays (174,176) having a connector or slot (170,172), respectfully. Functionally, the ability of a user to connect a plurality of connections is clearly met and not hindered, as Fung, permits a plurality of connections, via the trays (174,176).

Fung discloses the claimed invention, in regards to the connectors (170,172) in two trays (174,176), respectfully, except for a single tray having the plurality of connectors (170,172). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize a configuration, whereby the trays (174,176) of Fung, each with a connector (170,172) are combined into a single tray, since it has been held that forming in one piece an article which has been formerly been formed in two pieces and put together involves only routine skill in the art. Howard v. Detroit Stove Works, 150 U.S. 164(1893).

Claim 2, Fung teaches a push-push mechanism facilitating movement of the multiple-connector apparatus (100).

Claim 3, Fung teaches a computer system (e.g. a notebook computer or a mobile phone, col. 8, lines 65-67 & col. 9, lines 1-9, Fung) comprising: a housing (120) having a top side and a sidewall; and a retractable, extendible port connector apparatus (100) having a plurality of port connectors (170,172) arranged in a plane substantially parallel to the top side and adapted to receive plural mating connectors (col. 11, lines 58-60, Fung) in a direction substantially parallel to the sidewall when in an extended position (e.g. position, fig. 10), and is capable of having only an outer face exposed beyond the sidewall when in a retracted position (e.g. position, fig. 11), but is silent as to the plurality of connector (170,172), of the port connector apparatus (100), being combined into a single tray. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the port connector

apparatus of Fung, by utilizing a configuration whereby the trays are combined, i.e. utilizing a single tray with the two connector (170,172), instead of the configuration of presently used, in order to provide an alternate tray configuration, since these configurations are functional equivalents, and it would appear that either type of tray configuration would work equally in allowing a user to connect the plurality of connectors (170,172). For example, a user can connect a connector into a single tray having two connectors (170,172), and equally connect a connector in two trays (174,176) having a connector or slot (170,172), respectfully. Functionally, the ability of a user to connect a plurality of connections is clearly met and not hindered, as Fung, permits a plurality of connections, via the trays (174,176).

Fung discloses the claimed invention, in regards to the connectors (170,172) in two trays (174,176), respectfully, except for a single tray having the plurality of connectors (170,172). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize a configuration, whereby the trays (174,176) of Fung, each with a connector (170,172) are combined into a single tray, with two connectors or slots (170,172), since it has been held that forming in one piece an article which has been formerly been formed in two pieces and put together involves only routine skill in the art. *Howard v. Detroit Stove Works*, 150 U.S. 164(1893).

Claim 4, Fung teaches wherein: the sidewall has an aperture (e.g. aperture of (120), fig., 8); and the port connector apparatus (100) includes an extension/retraction mechanism (e.g. illustrated in fig. 12) that enables the port connector apparatus (100) to be extended and retracted through the aperture.

Claim 5, Fung teaches a computer system (e.g. a notebook computer or a mobile phone, col. 8, lines 65-67 & col. 9, lines 1-9) comprising: a housing (120) having an aperture (e.g. aperture of (120), fig. 8) (note: additional aperture of computer); and a means for changing (174,176) a total number of port connectors (170,172) exposed outside of the housing means (120); and wherein: the trays (174,176) enable the port connectors (170,172) to move back and forth through the aperture and moves to an extended position outwardly from the housing (120) for simultaneously connecting to plural peripheral

devices (col. 11, lines 58-60); and the tray (174,176) is mounted inside the housing (120) and not fully detachable from the housing (120)(e.g. illustrated in fig. 10), but is silent as to the trays (174,176) being combined into a single tray, i.e. the two connectors (170,172) being utilized in a single tray. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the connector tray assembly of Fung, by utilizing a configuration whereby the trays are combined, i.e. utilizing a single tray with the two connectors (170,172), instead of the configuration of presently used, in order to provide an alternate tray configuration, since these configurations are functional equivalents, and it would appear that either type of tray configuration would work equally in allowing a user to connect the plurality of connectors (170,172). For example, a user can connect a connector into a single tray having two connectors (170,172), and equally connect a connector in two trays (174,176) having a connector or slot (170,172), respectfully. Functionally, the ability of a user to connect a plurality of connections is clearly met and not hindered, as Fung, permits a plurality of connections, via the trays (174,176).

Fung discloses the claimed invention, in regards to the connectors (170,172) in two trays (174,176), respectfully, except for a single tray having the plurality of connectors (170,172). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize a configuration, whereby the trays (174,176) of Fung, each with a connector (170,172) are combined into a single tray, with the two connectors or slots (170,172), since it has been held that forming in one piece an article which has been formerly been formed in two pieces and put together involves only routine skill in the art. *Howard v. Detroit Stove Works*, 150 U.S. 164(1893).

Claim 7, Fung teaches a computer system (e.g. a notebook computer or a mobile phone, col. 8, lines 65-67 & col. 9, line 1-9) comprising: a housing (120); and a connector tray (174) or (176) connected to the housing (120) and having a plurality of port connectors (170,172) that simultaneously connect plural peripheral devices (col. 11, lines 58-60) when the connector tray is in an extended position (e.g. position, fig 10); and wherein: more port connectors (170,172) are accessible when the connector tray (174,176) is

extended at least partially outside the housing (120) than when the tray (174,176) is retracted (e.g. position, fig. 11) within the housing (120); and the connector tray (174,176) is mounted inside the housing (120) and not removable from the housing (120), but is but is silent as to the plurality of connectors (170,172), of the port connector apparatus (100), being combined into a single tray. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the port connector apparatus of Fung, by utilizing a configuration whereby the trays are combined, i.e. utilizing a single tray with the two connector (170,172), instead of the configuration of presently used, in order to provide an alternate tray configuration, since these configurations are functional equivalents, and it would appear that either type of tray configuration would work equally in allowing a user to connect the plurality of connectors (170,172). For example, a user can connect a connector into a single tray having two connector (170,172), and equally connect a connector in two trays (174,176) having a connector slot (170,172), respectfully. Functionally, the ability of a user to connect a plurality of connections is clearly met and not hindered, as Fung, permits a plurality of connections, via the trays (174,176).

Fung discloses the claimed invention, in regards to the connectors (170,172) in two trays (174,176), respectfully, except for a single tray having the plurality of connector (170,172). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize a configuration, whereby the trays (174,176) of Fung, each with a connector (170,172) are combined into a single tray with the two connector slot (170,172), since it has been held that forming in one piece an article which has been formerly been formed in two pieces and put together involves only routine skill in the art. Howard v. Detroit Stove Works, 150 U.S. 164(1893).

Additional: Official Notice is taken in regards to other prior art references, wherein connector device is not fully detachable from a housing, as Anderson US 6290517 B2 teaches a connector device (120) with multiple connectors (114') is not fully detachable from a housing (108) and Garside US 6186803 B1

teaches a connector (114) not fully detachable from a housing (116) of an electronic device (e.g. a mobile phone)

Claim 14, Fung teaches a computer system (Abstract), comprising: a retractable connector apparatus (100) that is mounted inside an aperture (e.g. a sidewall (e.g. implied but not shown by Fung,) having an aperture (e.g. aperture of body (120, fig. 8, Fung) (note: additional aperture of computer) therethrough) of the computer system (Abstract) and not detachable from the computer system (Abstract) wherein the connector apparatus (1) extends through the aperture (e.g. a sidewall (e.g. implied but not shown by Fung) having an aperture (e.g. aperture of body (120, fig. 8, Fung) (note: additional aperture of computer) therethrough) to expose multiple connectors (170,172), for simultaneously connecting plural peripheral devices, but is silent as to but is silent as to the trays (174,176) being combined into a single tray, i.e. the two connectors (170,172) being utilized in a single tray. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the connector tray assembly of Fung, by utilizing a configuration whereby the trays are combined, i.e. utilizing a single tray with the two connectors (170,172), instead of the configuration of presently used, in order to provide an alternate tray configuration, since these configurations are functional equivalents, and it would appear that either type of tray configuration would work equally in allowing a user to connect the plurality of connectors (170,172). For example, a user can connect a connector into a single tray having two connector (170,172), and equally connect a connector in two trays (174,176) having a connector slot (170,172), respectfully. Functionally, the ability of a user to connect a plurality of connections is clearly met and not hindered, as Fung, permits a plurality of connections, via the trays (174,176).

Fung discloses the claimed invention, in regards to the connectors (170,172) in two trays (174,176), respectfully, except for a single tray having the plurality of connectors (170,172). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize a configuration, whereby the trays (174,176) of Fung, each with a connector (170,172) are combined into a

single tray with the two connectors or slots (170,172), since it has been held that forming in one piece an article which has been formerly been formed in two pieces and put together involves only routine skill in the art. *Howard v. Detroit Stove Works*, 150 U.S. 164(1893).

Claim 15, Fung teaches further a housing (120); and wherein the retractable multiple-connector apparatus (100) is integrated with the housing (120).

Claim 16, Fung teaches wherein: the retractable multiple-connector apparatus (100) retracts entirely into the computer system (Abstract).

Claim 17, Fung teaches further a housing (120); and wherein the retractable multiple-connector apparatus (100) retracts within the housing (120) to a position at which a remote side of the retractable multiple-connector apparatus is flush with a wall of the housing (120).

2. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fung et al. US 6217351 (hereinafter: "Fung") in view of Johnson et al. US 6217350 B1 (hereinafter: "Johnson").

Claim 6, in regards to all the limitations of claim 5 above, Fung is silent as to clear view of the means for holding the port connectors (170,172) in a retracted position relative to the housing (102); and the means for releasing the port connectors (170,172) from the retracted position relative to the housing (102). Johnson teaches a means (100,90), for holding connectors in a retracted position and a means (e.g. a button, col. 5, lines 40-47, Johnson) for releasing the connectors. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the means (100,90) of Johnson in the invention of Fung, in order to allow a user to quickly/easily connect jacks to the electronic device of Fung, and to conveniently store the connector tray (174,176), when not in use.

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 8-13 are allowed.

4. Claims 18-20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

5. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the allowability resides in the overall structure of the device as recited by independent claims 8, 11 & 18, and at least in part, because claim 8 recites: "wherein the second portion pivots relative to the first portion when the first and second portions are released in the extended position," and claim 11 recites: "pivoting the second portion relative to the first portion when the multiple connector tray is in the extended position," and claim 18 recites: "wherein the multiple-connector apparatus has a first portion and a second portion, the second portion pivots relative to the housing upon being extended from the housing." The aforementioned limitations in combination with all remaining limitations of claims 8, 11 & 18 are believed to render the claim 8, 11 & 18 and all claims dependent thereupon, patentable over the art of record.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20, filed on 12/21/07, have been fully considered. The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the remarks of the Applicant. Although, the Amendment changed the scope of the claims, the Examiner contends that Fung clearly teaches the functionality of allowing a user to connect a plurality of connectors (170, 172), via connector trays (174, 176) and that it would be obvious to combine the trays (174) & (176) into one single tray, since this is well within the skill of one of ordinary skill in the art.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the


Application/Control Number:
10/758,386
Art Unit: 2835

Page 10

event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ingrid Wright whose telephone number is (571)272-8392. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jayprakash Gandhi can be reached on (571)272-2800, ext 35. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

IDW


11/17/08
JAYPRAKASH GANDHI
SENIOR PATENT EXAMINER